

REMARKS

In light of the comments found in the Advisory Action mailed on or about October 8, 2003, applicants submit the proposed claims filed on or about September 24, 2003 with minor modification. The following comments are responsive to the comments in said Advisory Action as well as in the final rejection.

To the extent that new claim 31 may be directed to a non-elected species. Applicants would note that claim 30 is generic to the elected species. If that claim is allowed, as it should be, the species covered by claim 31 should also be included in this application as it is a dependent claim.

Applicants reference to Fig. 2 was directed to the drawing objections. Applicants correctly pointed out that the subject matter of then Claim 10 had been appropriately shown given the impossibility of showing all the combinations and permutations of interchangeable modules. Rule 83(a) does not serve to impose unreasonable burdens.

Applicants take issue with the objections to the specification at pages 8-10 and 15 as set forth in the final rejection on page 2. The specification is directed to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such a person does not require a specification to be encumbered by a detailed description of gear ratio adjustment, consumption optimization and tiltable cab portions and platform portions. When

these features, per se, are themselves well known. It is their combination with the features of the main claims that defines a novel and unobvious combination that is adequately described in the specification.

For similar reasons, applicants take issue with and request reconsideration of the rejection of original claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 18, 19, 22-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 and 2. In any event, applicants believe that the written description adequately supports the claim features in new claims 30-43 and would not require unreasonable experimentation by those skilled in the art. The antecedent issue raised under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, has been addressed in the new claims.

We note that the now rejected claims have not been rejected over the prior art. Applicant submit that the new claims are also not properly rejected over any of the prior art of record. Accordingly, early reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly solicited.


If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit
Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #100728.52918CO).

November 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:ast